

**SUBMISSION on the  
Sex-Discrimination Amendment (Sexual Orientation, Gender  
Identity and Intersex Status) Bill 2013**

to the

**The Senate Legal and Constitutional Affairs Committee**

PO Box 6100, Parliament House, Canberra ACT 2600

Telephone: 02 6277 3560 Facsimile: 02 6277 5794

Email: [legcon.sen@aph.gov.au](mailto:legcon.sen@aph.gov.au) Website: [www.aph.gov.au](http://www.aph.gov.au)

by

**Susan Kirk**

**25 April 2013**

---

I request that this Bill NOT be supported because the Bill right from the onset at the Title and Preamble then throughout the Bill introduces the idea of same-sex relationships as being the equivalent of marriage or to be treated in the same way as marriage. The two are very distinct and separate. This is in direct contradiction to the Marriage Act, which acknowledges that marriage is between one man and one woman.

Throughout the bill, by replacing marital status with relationship status it appears to be an attempt to pave the way for same-sex marriage legislation. This legislation was voted against by parliament only a few months ago. Those who are in a same-sex relationship themselves have admitted that it is not the same as 'marriage' and are even against such legislation as it is really about dissolving the meaning of marriage. You can read about one such case at [www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2013/03/9432/](http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2013/03/9432/) written by Doug Mainwaring "I'm Gay and I Oppose Same-Sex Marriage". In his conclusion he says, "Marriage is not an elastic term. It is immutable. It offers the very best for children and society. We should not adulterate nor mutilate its definition, thereby denying its riches to current and future generations."

Further the proposed definition of gender identity (in proposed Section 4 (1)) is very vague and unclear. It appears that it would be whatever a person chose as the 'gender (i.e. sex) that he/she identified with, which could change from time to time. It is totally unreasonable and unjust that the community should be under the threat of discrimination and breaching the Act because they are unable to ascertain, by things objectively observable, whether a person has a gender identity.

Another factor that makes the Bill very disturbing is the fact that by removing the definition of man, woman and replacing de facto spouse with de facto partner means that words that have real and deep, scientific meaning and significance are being replaced with words that either have no definite meaning or whose meaning has been changed.

Another instance where language has been used to change the meaning of things is through the replacement of different sex for opposite sex. Opposite means there are two; whereas different means there are more than two. The biological reality of two sexes is being substituted with the idea that there are other types of sexual identity than male and female. Sexual orientation means a person is sexually attracted to persons of the same sex not that he/she is of a different sex.

In conclusion, I request that the BILL NOT be supported.